


Board Meeting Paper		
Mar 17 BM A 5.0		
Purpose of report	<input type="checkbox"/> Decision ¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion / debate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information only ²	
Sensitive Information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If sensitive, protective marking³		
Date of Meeting		16/03/2017
Agenda Item		A 5.0
Report Title		What road users want from the second road investment strategy (2020-25)
Sponsor		Guy Dangerfield
Author(s)		Phil Carey

1. Summary	
<p>The accompanying document is a draft of a publication setting out what road users want from DfT's second road investment strategy (RIS2). It is designed to help Highways England, DfT and ORR ensure that RIS2 focuses on the things that matter most to road users. The document has been shared in draft form with those three key stakeholders and their minor suggestions incorporated.</p>	
2. Recommendations / decision required	
<p>As this amounts to the creation of Transport Focus policy, the Board is asked to consider the paper, with a view to its approval and subsequent publication. In doing so, Members' attention is drawn to four particular to the issues highlighted in section 3 below.</p>	
3. Further details	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our statement that consideration should be given to transferring responsibility for litter picking of SRN 'A' roads from district and unitary authorities to Highways England (they have this responsibility already with Motorways) - Our statement that consideration should be given to giving Highways England sole responsibility for the management of junctions with the SRN, removing risks (in particular safety risks) arising from split responsibilities at an inherent point of weakness - Our question whether the M6 Toll should be made temporarily free at the point of use when Highways England's M6 is closed, either for scheduled roadworks or because of an incident - Our floating of the idea that cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians might be better served if RIS2 had a clear objective to separate motorised and non-motorised traffic, rather than spend money on piecemeal improvements for a small number of individuals. 	
4. Implications – Financial, Risk, Legal, Staffing	
N/A	
5. Background information	
Description	Web Link

¹ If a decision is required, or you are asking for the paper to be formally noted, please set this out in section 2

² If for information only, please make clear in section 1 **why** this information is being provided

³ ie **OFFICIAL/SENSITIVE**: plus COMMERCIAL / POLICY / MANAGEMENT-STAFF / PERSONAL PROTECT

6. Equalities screen

Sometimes, an equalities impact assessment (EIA) is required for a given report, proposal or project. To help decide whether an EIA is required, a screen must be undertaken based on the information provided above. The screen seeks answers to four questions which are used to determine impact on the protected characteristics – major, minor or none (default). Please choose the correct impact value and, if **major**, link it to an explanation below.

Gender	Age	Sexual orient'n	Disability	Marital status	Political belief	Religious belief	Racial group
1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories?							
None	None	None	Some	None	None	None	None
2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?							
None	None	None	Some	None	None	None	None
3. To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?							
					None	None	None
4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?							
					None	None	None

Summary of **major** impacts

1	
2	

Conclusion (the board's consideration of this paper may result in a change of conclusion)

Based on the information above, and having regard to the guidance below, the sponsor and author of this paper agree that (✓)	
(a) A full equalities impact assessment is not required	✓
(b) A full equalities impact assessment is not required at this time but the impact values above suggest the matter should be kept under view during the lifetime of the project	
(c) A full equalities impact assessment is required and should be completed during the lifetime of the project	
(d) A full equalities impact assessment is required and should be completed immediately	
Please provide a brief explanation of why you have arrived at this conclusion	
<p><i>The proposal has little no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations and / or is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.</i></p>	